WHAT IS AND WHAT IS UNDERSTOOD BY OROBANCHE FOETIDA POIR., VOY. BARBARIE 2: 195[-196] (1789)?
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ABSTRACT: After carefully reviewing its protologue and lectotype, it is concluded that Orobanche foetida Poir. (1789) is an earlier synonym of Orobanche variegata Wallr. (1825) and cannot be used for the western Mediterranean species to which in recent times it has been generally applied. Unless the conservation of that concept of the binomen Orobanche foetida is proposed and approved, that Iberian and North African plant must be called Orobanche hookeriana Ball. Key words: Nomenclature, Orobanche foetida, O. hookeriana, O. variegata, Mediterranean flora, Orobanchaceae, broomrape.

RESUMEN: ¿Qué es y que se entiende por Orobanche foetida Poir., Voy. Barbarie 2: 195[-196] (1789)? Tras un detenido estudio de su protólogo y lectótipo, se concluye que Orobanche foetida Poir. (1789) es un sinónimo prioritario de Orobanche variegata Wallr. (1825) y no puede usarse para la especie del Mediterráneo occidental a la que en los últimos tiempos venía por lo general aplicándosele. Mientras la conservación en ese uso del binomen Orobanche foetida no sea propuesta y aprobada, esa especie ibérica y norteafricana debe llamarse Orobanche hookeriana Ball. Palabras clave: nomenclatura, Orobanche foetida, O. hookeriana, O. variegata, flora mediterránea, Orobanchaceae, jopo.

INTRODUCTION

The Mediterranean flora comprises all five so far described species of Orobanche Subsect. Cruentae (Beck) Teryokhin [“Trib. Cruentae” sensu BECK (1890); “Grex Cruentae” sensu BECK (1930)], (cf. CARLÓN & al., 2005 onwards), a monophyletic set of polyploids (SCHNEEWEISS & al., 2004a, 2004b), parasitic on Fabaceae and with deep-red coloration at least in the inner side of the corolla as the most obvious synapomorphy. This papers aims to clarify the nomenclature of two of these species, for which not only as a result of misapplication but also misconception, the names foetida and variegata have been ambiguously used since very early.
DISCUSSION

The species generally known in recent times as *Orobanche foetida* is widely distributed around the south-western Mediterranean and adjacent Atlantic areas (Algeria, Morocco, Portugal, Spain and Tunisia, see PUJADAS & al., 2003), its abundance increasing westwards (CARLÓN & al., 2005 onwards), whereas that recently referred to under the name *Orobanche variegata* has a more easterly distribution, with an overlapping area in North Africa but not even reaching the Iberian Peninsula and much more abundant around its Sicilian *terra classica* (WALLROTH, 1825: 43), its range covering also Sardinia, Tunisia and, as mentioned before, parts of Algeria (CARLÓN & al., 2005 onwards).

The aforementioned species share the strong odour underlying the name *foetida* and are relatively similar, some of their differences being uneasily enunciated, which in addition to the unfortunate fact that the *terra classica* of Poiret’s species (“Barbarie ... l’ancienne Numidie [N.E. Algeria]”, see POIRET, 1789: 195-196; “J’ai découvert cette plante en Barbarie, dans les bois, du côté du Cap-Rose [Cap Rosa, El Taref / El Tarf Province, Algeria]. (V.v.)”, see POIRET, 1798: 622) lies in the area where both species co-occur, explains that, at least since BIVONA-BERNARDI (1813: [15]) and PRESL (1820) used the name *O. foetida* for Sicilian plants, both names have been often indistinctly used. Moreover, A. P. de CANDOLLE (1815: 392) further confounded the issue by using the name *Orobanche foetida* for French plants that, judging by his description and by the fact that neither of the aforementioned species is known to occur in France (TISON & al., 2014: 1444), are to be referred to *O. gracilis* Sm., a widespread member of the same group.

Which name should thus be applied to each of those two apparently vicariant Mediterranean species? The currently most used concept of *foetida* (CHATER & WEBB, 1972: 293; FOLEY, 2001: 233) takes root in the description and illustration by DESFONTAINES (1798: 59), who undoubtedly referred to the same species that HOFFMANNSEGG & LINK (1813: 316) studied years after in Portugal and to which, surely inspired by Desfontaines, called *Orobanche foetida*, a plant that had been known in Portugal since pre-Linnean times (TOURNEFORT, 1689: 121 “Orobanche elegans aestiva atropurpurea”). But, was this western species the one that Poiret actually described?

The Latin diagnosis in Poiret’s protologue is brief and almost useless, but his more detailed French description contains a first clue to successfully unravel the enigma. Truly, most of the alluded features are shared by both species, but there is one –the branched habit of the plant (“Ses tiges ... il s'en élève trois ou quatre de la même racine”)– almost completely absent in the western species while very frequent in that described from Sicily as *O. variegata*. If this was all, the western concept of “*foetida*” might not be firmly ruled out, but a description published by Poiret himself a few years later (POIRET, 1798: 622) adds enough details about both the corolla (“La corolle a un tube court”) and the calyx (“Le calice est formé de deux valves bifides dont les découpages sont presque mucronées”) to dispel all doubts and unambiguously identify *Orobanche foetida* Poiret with *Orobanche variegata* Wallr., the long, proportionately narrower tubular flowers and the linear-lanceolate, apically filiform calyx teeth being amongst the hallmarks of the western species (see fig. 5 and cf. BECK, 1930: 290, 292; PUJADAS, 2002: 433, 435 t. 31 fig. e-f).

Does the type material support this unexpected bibliographical conclusion? *Orobanche foetida* Poiret was typified by DOMINA & al. (2013), who designated as type the left-hand of the two specimens contained in the same herbarium sheet
that Foley had invalidly, in schedis, considered type (MNHN-P00102803-herb. E. Cosson, fig. 1). After a careful study of this sheet, we must conclude that neither of its specimens can be attributed to the western species to which by means of that typification the name foetida wanted to be definitely linked. Despite incomplete, both specimens (the one determined as “Orobanche foetida Poir.” [right-hand] and that determined as “Orobanche foe-
tida Desf.” [left-hand]) show unequivocally the characteristic flower morphology of *Orobanche variegata* Wallr.: calyx with triangular-lanceolate teeth, subulate and far from filiform apically (figs. 2, 3 and 5); corolla with short and comparatively wide tube and the typical *O. variegata* colour pattern when dried: intensely dark-brown in distal 1/2-2/3 (not only in the apex) and much lighter in the basal 1/3-1/2 (figs. 2, 3 and 5). Although we haven’t seen the exact epitype designated by DOMINA & al. (2013), judging by the pictures of specimens from the very same W. Schimper’s Algerian gathering conserved in K and P (CARLÓN & al., 2005 onwards, sub *O. variegata*), it must be assumed to taxonomically also correspond to *Orobanche variegata*. A picture of another Algerian sheet labelled as foetida and expressively showing the difference between the two here discussed species is linked in CARLÓN & al. (2005 onwards, sub *O. variegata*): the right-hand specimen of MNHN-P03428421, collected by A. Le-tourneux, corresponds to the western, traditional concept of “Orobanche foetida”, whereas the left-hand one, part of the same gathering better preserved as MNHN-
P02978379, is referable to *O. variegata*, and thus to *O. foetida* sensu typico.

**CONCLUSION**

By means of the above arguments we consider to have firmly established that both the protologue and the type currently designated don’t allow applying the valid and legitimate name *Orobanche foetida* Poir. for the western Mediterranean species for which it is nowadays almost unanimously used, even in agronomical context (KHARRAT & al., 1992; RUBIA-LES & al., 2005). Therefore, for the sake of nomenclatural stability it appears recommendable to propose the conservation of the current usage of the binomen *Orobanche foetida*, a step that we will carefully consider formalising in the next future. In the meantime, the situation can be summarised as follows:

**Orobanche foetida** Poir., Voy. Barbarie 2: 195[-196] (1789)

= *O. variegata* Wallr., Orobanches Gen. Diask.: 40 (1825)

= *O. condensata* Moris, Stirp. Sard. Elench. 2: 8 (1828)

**Orobanche hookeriana** Ball in J. Linn. Soc., Bot. 16(96-97): 605 (1877-1878 [17-VI-1878]). Lectotypified by Domina & al. (2013)

= *O. foetida* auct. plar., non Poir.
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Fig. 1. *Orobanche foetida* Poir. (MNHN-P00102803). The left-hand specimen is the lectotype designated by Domina & al. (2013). Image available at http://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p00102803
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Fig. 2. *Orobanche foetida* Poir., detail of the lectotype (left-hand specimen).

Fig. 3. *Orobanche foetida* Poir., detail of the paralectotype (right-hand specimen).
Fig. 4. *Orobanche foetida* (MNHN-P00102803), labels of lectotype (left-hand) and paralectotype (right-hand), showing that attending to the protologue any of both specimens might have been chosen as lectotype.

Fig. 5. Flowers of a) the central Mediterranean *Orobanche variegata* (=*O. foetida* sensu typico) and b) the Atlantic and western Mediterranean *O. hookeriana* (=*O. foetida* auct.); c) flowers of *O. variegata* (=*O. foetida*) in its *terra classica* (Sicily, near Librizzi, photo: Carmelo Rifici); d) flowers of *O. hookeriana* (Sevilla, pr. Guillena [herb. Sánchez Pedraja 10504b]). Compare (a) and (c) with figs. 2 and 3. *(The graphic scale is valid for the drawings only).*
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